

A MALAYĀLAM-SCRIPT RĀMĀYAṆA MANUSCRIPT

The starting point for my investigations on the manuscript that I shall describe below was Dr Shah's comment in his introduction to the Uttarakāṇḍa, where he drew particular attention to variations within the manuscripts written in the Malayālam script¹. This comment corroborated my own impression that the Southern Recension of the Rāmāyaṇa was not as uniform as has often been stated and led to my planning a research trip to India to look for and examine Rāmāyaṇa manuscripts, in particular some in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library of the University of Kerala, Trivandrum.

Basically, the issue I wished to examine was the divergence of the text as transmitted into the Northern and Southern recensions, and the interrelationship of these two, in particular through those manuscripts which combine features of both, most often by a conflation of the two at a relatively recent stage in the chain of transmission but perhaps occasionally by retention of older features. I decided to concentrate on the Ayodhyākāṇḍa, where the problem is focused on the

1. U.P. SHAH, ed., *The Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa, Critical Edition, vol. VII, Uttarakāṇḍa* (Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1975), introduction p. 5; cf. U.P. SHAH, "Rāmāyaṇa Manuscripts of Different Versions", in V. RAGHAVAN, ed., *The Ramayana Tradition in Asia* (Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1980) pp. 93-102, esp. pp. 97-8.

anomalous manuscript M4. Dr Shah had already identified one manuscript in the Trivandrum collection (no. 14052) as being similar to M4 and I was able to confirm this on personal examination; unfortunately, it contains only about half the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* (ending with App. I 18.17, inserted into *sarga* 55). However, I was completely unsuccessful in obtaining a microfilm then or subsequently and it was not until three years later that I received a transcript in Devanāgarī. The closeness of this manuscript and M4 is marked by common absence of material rather than additions, indicating relative antiquity. However, omissions unique to each prove that, despite their regular shared readings, neither was copied from the other, nor probably from an immediate ancestor, although they are probably of comparable age². There is some indication that the Trivandrum manuscript is closer to their ultimate exemplar than M4 is. However, they both combine features of the present N and S recensions; within the N recension they align particularly with D1.2 and to a lesser extent V1, which raises once again the issue of the precise status of the W recension.

Incidentally, I also discovered at Trivandrum another fragmentary manuscript (no. 13468) which essentially is a manuscript of the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* but has two leaves prefixed to it from near the end of the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* (covering CE 2.104.1-105.6); from the evidence of the variant readings even in so brief a passage³, it obviously belongs with M4 and the Trivandrum manuscript just noted to an alternative Malayāḷam tradition, which presumably therefore was fairly generally current in Kerala. Two other manuscripts there that I examined in some detail (nos 13366 and 19421) were, on the other hand, basically in agreement with the usual Southern recension⁴.

2. Vaidya declares of M4 that 'Though undated, the ms. seems to be at least 400 years old' (*The Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa*, Critical Edition, vol. II, Baroda, 1962, Introduction p. XIX); my own impression of ms. 14052 when I saw it at Trivandrum was that it must be of a similar age.

3. It contains several vv. II. where it agrees with M4 only (or in one instance with D3 M4) and the colophon number is recorded as 21, obviously with the 100 dropped, agreeing with M4's numbering of 121 against the standard S numbering of 112. The variants are *duḥkhiṭā* for *sarvā* at 104.25c, (and *sa cāpi* at the beginning of c with D3 M4), *dṛṣṭavrataḥ* at 105.2b and *cāruḷocanaḥ* at 105.6d.

4. Even so, already in the first *sarga*, for example, ms. 19421 produced one new variant, *dharmah sadopakāreṇa* (for *kathaṃ cid upakāreṇa*) at 1.16a, and ms. 13366

There are, of course, large numbers of Rāmāyaṇa manuscripts preserved in various collections, most of which are relatively late (thus making it impractical to construct the kind of family tree that is regularly done for, say, Greek and Latin texts). This is true, of course, for most Sanskrit texts and most manuscript collections contain predominantly manuscripts of the 16th to 19th centuries, but for the Rāmāyaṇa this means an even bigger gap than usual since the origins of the text. However, the Critical Edition necessarily utilised a relatively small number of manuscripts (29 in the case of the Ayodhyākāṇḍa) and so variant readings and new patterns of omission or addition can be found in virtually every manuscript examined.

I will next provide a more detailed conspectus of the variants in the first twenty *sargas* of this Malayālam manuscript, noting in particular its agreements and divergences from M4. Apart from the noting of its *sarga* numbers, all references are given according to the CE numbering.

Its *sarga* 1 corresponds to App. I 4.1-64 and it omits CE 1.1-7 along with V1 M4. From App. I 4 it omits ll.22, 24-27 with M4 and ll.53-60 with Ñ2 M4. It agrees with the CE reading against M4 at ll.5, 6, 9, 21, 35 (*tadā*) and 39 (where M4 is damaged) but has the reading of M4 only at ll.11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 28, 30, 31, 35 (*punaḥ*), 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 61 and 64; it agrees with Ñ2 only at l. 15.

Its *sarga* 2 corresponds to 1.8-33 and 2.14cd-(34). Within 1.8-33, it inserts 9* (with Ñ2 V1 B1.2 M4), omits 10c-15b with M4 only, substitutes 20* for 16a-29b (with Ñ2 V1 B1.2 M4 – various lines are also read by other mss – omitting ll. 9-10 with M4 only and also ll. 15-16) except that it has 17 (with a reading close to Ś1 D1-7: *śilavṛddhān vayovṛddhān jñānavṛddhān ca mānavān / sevate ... sa vai nityam astrayogyāntare sadā //*) for 20*1-2 and 14* 1 for 20* 8 (ending: *praśrayavān api*); it inserts 22* and 27* 4-6 and omits 34-2.14ab (with Ñ2 V1 B1.2 M4). It agrees with M4 only at 8b, 20* 12,

(which was utilised as M5 in the Yuddha and Uttara kāṇḍas) produced two, *devānām* for *bhūtānām* at 10c and *drśyāmi* for *drakṣyāmi* at 30c. Incidentally, both of these manuscripts and also ms. 5069 read *parabalārdane* (for *parapurārdane*) at 30*5, indicating that this reading has wide support in Malayālam as well as Telugu manuscripts.

18, 19, 20, 23, 29cd, 27*4 (cf. v.l. of G ed. for 2.2.14ab) but agrees with the CE reading against M4 at 10ab and 20* 5. Within 2.14cd-(34), it omits 19-21b (with Ñ2 V1 B1.2 M4), substitutes 42* for 22ab, inserts 47(A)* inside 47* (with V1 M4), omits 23 (with Ñ2 V1 B1.2 M4), substitutes 52* + 53* for 24 cd (omitting 53* 1 with V1 M4), omits 26c-30 substituting 54*, substitutes 57* for 32ab and 58* [l.v.] for 34 [l.v.]. It agrees with CE against M4 at 47*5 but agrees with M4 only at 14cd, 47* 7, 8, 24b, 54* and 57*, while it has a unique variant at 24a: *yūyam* for *yadā*.

Its *sarga* 3 corresponds to 3.1-32. It substitutes 61* for 4cd, 85* for 27cd and 87* for 29ab, and inserts 63* after 4 and 82* + 84* (with D5 M4) after 27ab. It has unique variants at 15a (*sutaṃ* for *sa taṃ*), 19b (*vyarājata sa* for *vyadīpayata*; M4 reads *vyadīpyata sa*), 19d (*ubhaye* in error for *udaye*) and 21c (*svalaṃkṛtam* for *alaṃkṛtam*); it agrees with M4 only at 1d, 3ab, 63*4, 9b, 13cd, 14d, 16c, 18a, 19c, 23d, 24d, 25a, 82* 4 pr., 29d, 31c, 32b [l.v.] (except *tadā* for *yathā*) and with V1 M4 at 28a; however, it agrees with CE against M4 at 8b, 11b and 20a.

Its *sarga* 4 corresponds to 4.1-45. It has unique variants at 15d (*tasmai* for *tan me*), 18b (*bhṛśaiḥ* for *grahaiḥ*) and 22a (*adya putrābhiṣekan te* for *tatra puṣye 'bhiṣiñcasva*; cf. M4 *adya putrābhiṣektuṃ tvām*); it agrees with M4 only at 6a, 21d, 24d, 25a, 30d, 31c, 34b, 35cd, 41d and 43d; it agrees with CE against M4 at 12d, 20c and 32c and with Ś1 Ñ2 V1 B1.4 D5 at 19d. At 45b it has the same reading as D1-5.7 M4 but interestingly the final *ha* of M4 only has been corrected to the *ca* of the other mss.

Its *sarga* 5 corresponds to 5.1-24. It inserts 94* after 3 and 101* after 22. It has unique variants at 12b (*sahitais taiḥ* for *sahāsinaḥ*; cf. M4 *sahasītaiḥ*), 22c (*tasmaikaṃ* for *tasmai tat*) and 24c [l.v.] (*niveśitañ* for *vyadīpayamś*; cf. M4 *neveśanam*); it agrees with M4 only at 7a, 7c, 9c, 10d, 11d, 12c, 15d, 16c, 17b, 20d, 21c, 101* 1 (both), 23c and 24b [l.v.]; but it agrees with CE against M4 at 5c, 16a, 22c and 24a [l.v.].

Its *sarga* 6 corresponds to 6.1-28. It omits 16c-18b with M4 only (M2 omits 16cd). It has a unique variant at 26cd (... *yām āsa purīm jānapado janaḥ* for pl. of CE); it agrees with M4 only at 1a, 5a, 7a, 14b, 15b, 15d, 21c, 25ab and 28b [l.v.]; but it agrees with CE against M4 at 3d, 6a, 9d, 12c and 28d [l.v.].

Its *sarga* 7 corresponds to 7.1-31 (with the substitution of the N* passages). It substitutes 112*-113* for 1-2 (with v.l. of M4 only in 113*2), inserts 114* (absent from M4) but omits 3 along with Ś1 V1 B D6 M4, substitutes 117* for 4ab and 118*1 for 5cd. It then continues with a corrupt śloka (*kin nṛpateḥ kāryaṃ pauraṇapriyaṃ uttamaṇa // ca harṣeṇa harṣitādya viśeṣataḥ rāmacanam* /), the first line of which is all but the first word of 118*2, followed by the start of 4c, which continues in the second line, the final word perhaps being a corruption of the end of 119*2. It then substitutes 120*1 for 7ab (as M4; Ś1 Ń2 V1 B D6 substitute 120*1-2 for 7a-d), inserts 123* (absent from M4), substitutes 125* for 11, omits 13ab with M4 only, inserts 126* (read by B4 M4; its readings agree with M4), omits 7.19-25 (with B1-3 but not M4), inserts 128*1-2 and 129*1-2, and substitutes 131* for 31cd [l.v.]. Its unique variant at 10b (*bhayaṃ tvā ghoram āgatam*) is nearer to the N mss than to M4 and it has another unique variant at 29c (*etasmin vai priyākhyāne*); it agrees with M4 only at 7d, 10cd, 17bc, 18a, 18c, 26c and 30a; but it agrees with CE against M4 at 16a and 26d, with B2 at 26b, and with Ń2 V1 B at 30b and cd (agreeing with them in the transposition against M4).

Its *sarga* 8 corresponds to 8.1-27 [l.v.]. It substitutes 132*1-2 for 1, adds 133*1-2 after 2, substitutes 136* for 4ab and 139*1-2 for 5, inserts 140* after 8ab, omits 10ef, inserts 145* after 14ab and continues with 146*1-2 (with M4 only) but uniquely omits 14cd, substitutes 147*2 for 15cd (with M4 only), uniquely omits 17, omits 21cd (with M4 only), substitutes 152* for 22 and omits 24-26 (with M4 only). It has unique variants at 16b (*bhātum arhasi* for *bhaviṣyati*) and 20a (*yukto* for N *bhakto*), and a corruption at 18c (*pāhayitā* for *nāyayita*); it agrees with M4 only at 2a, 139*2, 8c, 12a, 12d, 14a, 15a, 16a, 152*2 and 23d; but it agrees with CE against M4 at 7b, 7d and 27b [l.v.], with V1 at 136* and with B2.4 at 139*1.

Its *sarga* 9 corresponds to 9.(1)-46 [l.v.]. It substitutes 154* for 9.1-4 (omitting l. 2 with M4 only), continuing with the variant in M4 only for 8ab, reads 6cd-7 (absent from M4), 8 (ab as in text of CE, cd with vv.ll. of M4 and other mss), 5 and 9ab, substitutes 157* (with v.l. of M4 only) for 9cd and 160* + 161* for 12-13, omits 14ef (with D1.2 M4), inserts 165* (with v.l. of D2 M4 in l. 3), omits 18-19 (with D1.2 M4), reads 21 after 23 (with M4 only), substitutes 167*3-4 and

168* for 24-26 (v.l. of D2 M4 in 167*3 post.; *prāpsyas ca kosavās ca bhaviṣyati* at 4 post.; insertion of 168* and omission of 26 with D1.2. M4), substitutes 173* for 28cd and 176* for 34ab, inserts 178* after 37*, omits 41cd (with M4 only) and 43 (with D1.2. T3 M4), inserts 183*1-2 (absent in M4) and 181*1-2, and omits 47 [l.v.] (with M4 only). It has unique variants at 32c (*kṛṣe* for *tanū* of v.l. in Ñ2 V1 B D1.2 M4), 33d (first two syllables lost: *geva virājase*) 34c (*kṣatramāśās ca* for *kṣatravidyās ca*; cf. M4 *kṣatravamaśānām*), 36b (*ratneṣv āptena sundarī* for *sunīṣaptena sundarī*) and 38e (*bhaviṣyasy anavadyā<ṇ>gi*); it agrees with M4 only at 154*5, 7, 23a, 27c, 36c, 37c, 178*, 38ef and 181*1, and with D1.2 M4 at 17d, 29c, 35d, 40d and 45d; but it agrees against M4 with Ñ2 V1 B D1.2 at 22b and with D3.4.7 at 38c.

Its *sarga* 10 corresponds to App. I 8 (part) and 10.2b-41. It reads App. I 8.1-2, 6 and 17 pr., followed by 2b-3c, 188* and 3d onwards (thus omitting 186*2 and 187*, found in M4), it omits 6cd and inserts 191* with D1.2 M4, substitutes 193* for 11ab and omits 11c-12b (with D1 M4), it inserts 195*, omits 15ab (with M4 only), inserts 197* into 16, inserts 203* after 20 (with D1.2 M4) and omits 21-25 (with D1.2 M4), substitutes (with N + M4) 201* for 18ab, 205* for 26, 206* for 27, 208* for 28, 211* for 29, 213* for 30, 214* for 31ab, inserts (with N + M4) 218* [l.v.], and omits 37-38 (with M4 only). It has a unique variant in 32d (*śokena paripīḍitaḥ*, cf. M4 *śokāgniparipīḍitaḥ*); it agrees with M4 only at 3ab, 4a, 7a, 13d, 15d, 201* post., 203*2, 205*2, 208*2, 211*1, 35d and 41a, and with D1.2 M4 at 5b, 5c, 6b, 7cd (not D2), 8d, 193*, 12c, 195*3, 14d, 16c, 203*, 208*1, 33d, 34b, 34c, 218*3 (*balavān* for their *balavat*) and 41c.

Its *sarga* 11 corresponds to 11.1-15. It substitutes 220* (reversing the order of the lines as some other mss, including M4) for 2, transposes 5ab and 5cd (with N and M4), inserts App. I 9.112-3 after 5 and App. I 9.148-9 after 6d, continuing with 222*1-3, App. I 9.147+150-1, and 222*4-9, it inserts App. I 9.179 after 6ef, omits 224* and 225*1-2 (both present in N and M4) and substitutes 227* for 10ab, but inserts 229* after 12 (with N and M4). It has a unique variant at App. I 9.150 (*guruśūśrūṣeṇa ca* for *gurbhiś copakarsitaḥ*); it agrees with M4 only at 1a, 3c, 5c, 222*1 (*°mānavāḥ*), 2, 5, 225*5, 229*4 and 13cd, and with D1.2 M4 at 3a, 4d, 225*4 (not D2), 12d (not D1), 229*1,3 and 14a.

Its *sarga* 12 corresponds to 12.1-24. It substitutes 231*-232* for 4-5, inserts 233*1+3 after 6 (as D1.2, not after 232* as other N + M4), thereafter reading 14cd (as M4 only), followed by 7ab (with vv.II. of D1.2 M4, except uniquely *kariṣyati*); it then repeats 233*1+3 up to 7 ab (as before)⁵; it substitutes 235* for 8 and 236* for 10, continuing with 237*, it then substitutes 238* for 11, continuing with 239* and 19, substitutes 243*-246* for 12-14ab and 247* for 16, inserts 248* into 17, omits uniquely 18 and also omits 20-23 (with most N and M4), and substitutes 257* for 24cd (with most N and M4). It has a unique variant at 237*3 of *mahāpāpān* (intermediate between the majority reading *aham pāpāṇi* and *mahābhāgāṇi* of M4); it agrees with M4 only at 1a, 1d, 232*2, 6a, 235*2, 236*, 238*2 and 239*1, 3, 9, 11, 13 and with D1.2 M4 at 9cd, 237*2, 238*1 and 239*6, 7, 8.

Its *sarga* 13 corresponds to 13.(1)-28. It substitutes 258* for 1-2, 260* for 3, 262* for 6, 266*-269* for 7-10 (omitting 267*2 with M4), 274* for 13, 276* for 16cd, 278* for 17, 281* for 18, 284* for 19ab, 287* for 20, 291*-292* for 21-22, 294* for 23, 298* for 26ab, 306* for 28ab; it inserts 295* after 294*, 297* after 26 (with D1.2 M4, where other N insert after 25) and 303* 1-2 + 304* after 27 [l.v.] (omitting 304*7-8 with M4 only); and it omits 11-12 with M4 only and 24-25 with various N mss + M4. It has a unique variant at 258*4 (*dravyaṃ sajjam kṛtvā* for *sarvaṃ kṛtvā tasthur*); it agrees with M4 only at 258*1-3, 266*4, 267*1, 268*1, 269*1, 274*2, 16a, 278*3, 4, 292*1, 295*2,7, 303*2, with D2 only in 4d, and with D1.2 and M4 at 303*1 and 306*1; it agrees with CE against M4 at 269*2, 294*1, 4, 295*2-4 (M4 omits), 297*2 and with D1.2 against M4 at 281*2 and 295*3 (also read by D5).

Its *sarga* 14 corresponds to 14.1-26. It substitutes 307*-309* for 1-3, 311* for 5, 312*-313* for 8-9, 314* for 12, 315*-316* for 13cd-14, 318* for 16ab, 319* for 17 (inserting 320*), 323*-324* for 20-21, 326* for 23cd and 329* for 26, while it omits 24-25 and 27. It agrees with M4 only at 309*1, 312*1, 2, 11c, 314*2, 316*1, 3, 15ab, 319*1,

5. It is possible, of course, that this is an error of the copyist of the *devanāgarī* transcript rather than of the manuscript.

4, 18a, 19c, 329*3 and partly 4 (*pratipūrayaṇ janaiḥ*), and with D1.2 M4 at 307*2 and 319*3; however, it agrees with CE against M4 at 311*1 and 18d, and with D1.2 against M4 at 320*3 and 18c. It is significant that at 313*2 the original reading of the manuscript (*vinayānvitah*) agrees with most manuscripts in which the passage occurs but it has been corrected to the M4 reading (*vinayānataḥ*).

Its *sarga* 15 corresponds to 15.1-12. It substitutes 333* for 1, 336*-344* for 4-10 (including 336(A)* with M4 only) and 347* for 11; it omits 2-3 (with Ñ V1 B D1.2 M4), 13 (with M4 only) and 14 [l.v.] (uniquely). It has unique variants at 336*1 (*rāmaḥ* for *vācaḥ*, after *cemāḥ* with D1 M4), 336(A)*3 (*'bhikāṅkṣatā* for *'bhiṣecyatām* of M4) and 342*5 (*rāmaṃ* for *yāntaṃ*); it agrees with M4 only at 333*2, 336*6, 8, 10, 11, 336(A)* (but note the variant), 336*13, 337*2, 338*, 340*2, 341*2 (reading *jīvītā api na priyāḥ*, whereas M4 has *naḥ*) and 12a, and with D1.2 M4 at 336*1 (not D2), 5, 342*2 and 347*2; but it agrees with various manuscripts against M4 at 336*4, 340*2 and 342*5.

Its *sarga* 16 corresponds to 16.1-25 plus 373*. It inserts (with most N + M3.4) 351* after 2, (with NE + M4) 355* after 9, 356* after 10, (with B2.4 D1.2 M4) 362* and 363* (omitting with Ś1 D4.5.7 M4 l.1 and uniquely ll.2-3), and with M4 only it inserts 24ab after 363*11 instead of 363*12; it substitutes 353* for 8cd, 358* for 14, 359*-360* for 15 and 364*-365* for 18ef-19. It has unique variants at 11c (*kṣubhitas* for *kupitas*) – also (with N + M4) transposing 11 to follow 13 – and 22a (*sūtra*, a corruption for *rājā/tatra*); it agrees with M4 only at 351*3, 10a, 10cd, 13b, 360*3,5, 362*3, 365*2 (but cf. D1.2), with D1.2 M4 at 351*2 (not D1), 5d, 353*1, 12b, 365*1 and 22d, with B2 M4 at 363*6-7, 8-10 (also B4) and 11, and with B2 D1.2 M4 at 363*13-17; however, it agrees against M4 with CE at 9c and with Ñ V1 B D1.2 at 7c. Its reading at 364*1 pr. (*dharmmāj jalyān niyuktas san*) is intermediate between that of Ñ2 V1 B D1.2 and that of M4; similarly at 364*3 it goes in part with D1.2 M4 and in part differs (*tvam apy amba tathaiva me*). Next it transposes 23 and 24 as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D1.2, but not M4 (which reads 24ab after 363*11 only and 24cd after 22), substituting 367* for 23cd; however, it then, with M4 only, omits 25c-26 (26 also omitted by Ñ2 V1 B1-3), continuing with 373*.

Its *sarga* 17 corresponds to 16.27-(61). It has unique variants at 57b (by transposition: *rāmaḥ kṛtvā pradakṣiṇam*) and 58cd (*lokanāthasya śaumyatvaṃ śītaraśmer ivākṣayam*). It substitutes 374*1 for 27ab, 375* for 29cd, 376* for 31, 379* for 35cd, 382* for 41, 384* for 43, 385* for 46cd, 386* for 48cd, 387*-389* for 50-51, 390*-392* for 53-4, 393* for 55cd, 396* for 56, 400* for 60 and 402* for 61, while it inserts 378* after 33, 383* after 42 and 398* + 55cd after 57. Most significantly it reads 36d-39c, which are omitted by M4 (including the substitution of 381* for 37 with Ñ2 V1 B D1). It agrees with M4 only at 376*1, 32b, 36ab, 382*2, 383*2, 44b, 47d, 52c, 391*1, 395*2, 396*3, 400*2 and 402*1; it agrees with B1.2.4 M4 at 32c and with D1.2 M4 at 33d, 378*1 (not D2), 34c (not D2), 379* (not D2), 383* 2 pr., 384*1-2, 44d (not D2), 391*3 (not D2), 396*1-2 (not D2), 395*1 and 402*2 (not D2); it agrees against M4 with Ś1 Ñ V1 B D1.2 at 30a (not Ś1 Ñ1), 49d (also D4-7, not B4), 59a (also D6, not D2; with D1 reading: *vasu*^o) and 59b (also D4-7, not D1).

Its *sarga* 18 corresponds to 17.1-33. It inserts 404* after 2, 409* after 8, 417* after 11, 421* after 14, 432* after 23 and 438* after 27; it substitutes 406* for 4-5, 407*-408* for 6c-7 (omitting 7cd), 412*-413* for 9cd, 415* for 10cd, 419* for 13, 423* for 15, 426* for 17, 427*-428* for 19-20, 429* + 430* for 22cd, 434* + 434(A)* + 435* for 25, and 439* for 28. It agrees with M4 only at 2ab, 404*2, 407*2, 408*, 409*4, 10b, 421*2, 426*4, 18d, 427*2, 23a, 434(A)*, 435*2,3, 26b, 26c, 30a, 30c and 441*3, with D1 M4 at 1b, 3a, 9a, 10a, 415*, 419*1, 426*3, 428*2, 21a, 429*, 432*, 24c, 434*1, 434(A)*, 30b, and 441*2, 4, and with D1 only at 24b, whereas it agrees with various other manuscripts against M4 at 22a, 24b and 30b. Its order at the end of the *sarga* is particularly interesting: 29 [l.v.], followed (as in Ś1 Ñ V1 D6 M4) by 32ab (but not by 441* as in these mss); 442* (subst. for 32cd in Ś1 Ñ V1 B D6 M4); 30 [l.v.] (which also follows 442* in B); 441* (subst. in Ś1 Ñ V1 B D1.6 M4 for 31, read in B after 33); 33 [l.v.].

Its *sarga* 19 corresponds to 18.1-39. It has unique variants at 444*2 (*vīra pītaṃ* for *rāma pītuḥ*), 6a (*ripun* for *ṛjuṃ*) and 26c (*prasādayāmi* for *prasādaye tvāṃ*). It omits 19cd (with D1 M4), 31 (with M4 only; D7 omits 31ab) and 40 (with D1 M4); it inserts 444* before 1, 462* after 22ab, 471* after 30ab, 474* after 32cd, 476* after 32ef, 481* after 38, and 483* after 39; it substitutes 445* for 4, 447* for 5,

448* for 7, 449* for 9, 450*-453* for 10-11, 455*-457* for 13-15, 459* for 18, 460*-461* for 19c-20d, 463* for 24ab, 467*-469* for 28 (469* is read by D1.5 only, not M4) and 477*-478* for 33-34. It agrees with M4 only at 444*2, 2b, 445*2, 451*1, 17d, 460*3, 23a, 23d, 463*, 25a, 32d, 474*1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 474(A)*, 474*9, 10, 477*2, 36bcd, 37ab, 39d and 483*2-4, and with D1 M4 at 2d, 448*2, 8d, 449*2 (also D5), 452*2 (also D5), 4, 453*, 455*2, 457*1, 19a (also D5), 460*2 (also D5), 461*, 21b, 25b, 32c, 477*2, 35d and 483*3, and with D1 only at 451*3 and 452*5; however, it agrees with other manuscripts against M4 at 447*1, 459*1, 462*1, 474*2, 474*9 and 39c.

Its *sarga* 20 corresponds to 489* (substitute of Ś1 Ñ V1 B D1.6 M4 for *sarga* 19). It has a unique variant for 1.14 post.: *kāmam mā paripīḍayet* (but compare the reading of D1). It agrees with M4 only at ll. 1, 6, 10, 12, 15, 16 (but cf. D1), 29, 30, 27 (postponed with D1 M4), 33, 35, 36, 39 and 42, with D1 M4 at ll. 4 (with *enam* as in D1, not M4), 5, 15, 17-18, 28, 30 and 41, and with D1 only at ll. 19-20 (M4 omits 19 post. to 23 pr.), although it has ll. 37-40 omitted by D1.

I will now present some of the major features from the remainder of the manuscript. In addition to the unique omissions already noted (20*1-2, 8.14cd, 17, 9.5, 8cd, 11.8/224*-225*2, 12.18, 15.14 [l.v.] and 363*2-3), it also omits uniquely 22.5cd + ef (and so presumably 566*), 599*2 to 23.26, App. I. 14.47-48, 33.10ab, 921*1, 35.13, 40.15cd-16 and 25-26b, 42.15ab and 25cd. Its unique variants after 489* include: 500*3 post. (*śakyau na śaṅkitum*), 501*2 (*pariśaṅkitāḥ* for *paricintitāḥ*), App. I.12.78 (*daśagaṇaṃ pitā cāpy atiricyate* for *daśa pitā tathaiva vy°*), App. I.12.91 pr. (*athānunitān tāñ cakre* for *athānunetuṃ cakre 'sau*), App. I.12.119 (*vaktavyo* for *draṣṭavyo*; cf. the same substitution by M4 in the next line), a unique line (*tīrṇapratijñāḥ kṛtvā tvaṃ pitara x x vādinam*) inserted after 556*1, which is then repeated, 556*3 (*vaktavyaṃ* for *kartavyaṃ*), 526*3 (*°samuddhūtas* for *°mahādhūmas*), 585*2 (*putra gacchety* by transposition for *gaccha putrety*), 25.2b (*manasvinī* for *yaśasvinī* of most N mss), 645*3 (*punyeṣv* for *vaneṣv*), 676*2 (*vane netum arhasi mā* for *netum arhasi mā vīra*), 27.11a (*kuśakāśaiśikāś caiva* for *kuśakāśaśa-reṣikā*; Ś1 D4.6.7 M4 have *kuśakāśaśaraiśikāḥ*), 693*2 (*vanavāsāt* for *vasamānā* in the v.l. of Ñ1 D1.2.4.5.7 M4), 753*5 (*tathaivājñākarāś ca ye* for *purato vācakāś ca ye*; this line is omitted by several mss, including M4), 30.6a (*āyānti ca prayāntaṃ yañ* for

yaṃ yāntam anuyāti sma; V1 B1 D1.2 M4 read *anuyāti prayāntaṃ yaṃ*), 40.2ab (*nivartyamānā hi bhṛṣaṃ suhr̥dvargeṇa mānavāḥ*) and the reading of 42.19 after 1041*. Subsequently it has an apparently unique insertion of several lines between 47.32 and 33:

*nivṛttavanavāsas tu kaikeyyā sahito nagha
rājyaṃ prāpsyasi dharmajña piṭṛpaitāmaham mahātejā
bāhos tvadanyaṃ raghunandanaṃ (line defective)
nivṛttavanavāsasya rājyaṃ nīrya... tvayiṣyāti...
loke priyataṃ paśyāmi puruṣarṣabha
bharatasya mahātejā bāhos tvadanyaṃ raghunandana
yathāham eva bharata śatrughnaṃ cāparājita
nir ahaṃ vādino nno jīvitum uttamaṃ
na cāpi bharato rājyaṃ gr̥hīṣyati mahābalaḥ
atiśṛṣṭa tvayā vīra āryasatyena śape
ahaṃ ca bharataś caiva śataghnāparājitaḥ
prasādam abhikāṃkṣāmas tava nityam arindama
tadāśaśva mahābāho sarvaṃ mava hi rāghava
na hi kṣubhyati durvdhaśas samudras saritām iva⁶*

It then has a unique variant at 50.11ab (which appears intermediate between that and the Northern and M4 equivalent 1197*1), *ityevaṃ vīkṣamāṇau tau gacchantau saha sītayā*, and an apparently unique insert between ll. 1 and 2 of 1198* (M4 lacks 1198* entirely):

*tadā bahugunaṃ ramaś śaikama x dya vismitaḥ
nareśvarasuta śrīmān lakṣmaṇaṃ vākyam abravīt*

Within *sarga* 52, it has a unique ordering of 1292*1, 1297*5-6 and then 1292*2-3, followed by a version of 24ef (*mayā yad jīvitāsūta dustara śokasā...*) before continuing with 24a-d and 1295*. At 54.16cd it has successively the reading given in the text of the Critical Edition and the reading of Ñ2 B D1 M4 given in the apparatus.

Other material found in this manuscript that is absent from M4 comprises, besides that noted earlier: 753*5 (read by Ñ2 V1 B1

6. The last line is almost identical to 2.31.31cd (*na hi kṣubhyati durdharṣaḥ samudraḥ saritām patiḥ*) but it is, of course, proverbial in character.

D1.2.4), App. I 14.22 (omitted by Dm1 M4⁷) 40.2ab (omitted by M4 alone), 1081*, 1097*3-4, 1098*1-2 pr., 46.17c-20 (omitted by M4 alone) and 31ab, 50.1cd (for which M4 and some other mss substitute 1184*) and 11 (M4 substitutes 1197*), 1198*, 1200*, 1218* and 52.23cd-24ab (omitted by M4 alone). Its *sarga* numbering is one less than that of M4 in the middle of 2.46, since M4 ends its *sarga* 50 after App. I 16 while ms. 14052 continues it; thus, its last complete *sarga* is numbered 59, corresponding to M4's 60 (= CE 54).

Common omissions of this manuscript and M4 only, besides those noted above, comprise 20.1cd, App. I 12.45, 21.13c-14, 641*2, 656*2, 674*4, 27.2, 29.16 plus 755*1-2 and 4-11, 772*3-29.27 [l.v.], 792*2-793*1, App. I 13.34-5, 31.11c-13b, App. I 14.55-56, 60 and 65-68, 32.12ef, 34.7c-8 (Ś1 Ñ2 B D6 omit 7cd only), 35.7, 921*2, 35.27cd, 36.11ab, 40.9, 42.18 and 46.23ab; and further additions of these two manuscripts alone comprise 491*, 514*, App. I.12 additional line after 62, 534*, 562*, 579*, App. I 14 subst. for 42-44⁸, App. I 14 inserts after ll. 46 (reading *iti* for *iha* at 4 post.) and 59, and the reading of 15/874* before and after 873*; it also agrees with M4 only in its placing of 1029* and 1031* after 41.28, in continuing the *sarga* after 1032* and in its ordering of 42.11-13.

The Trivandrum manuscript agrees with D1.2 M4 in, for example, omitting – as well as 9.14ef, 18-19, 26, 43, 10.6cd, 21-25, 13.25, 18.19cd (not D2) and 40 (not D2) – 20.23c-34d, App. I.12.35-39, 58, 80-81 and 24.16, in inserting 168*, 203* and 362* (also in B2.4), in reading 620*4 after 632*, in the sequence of stanzas at 25.4-14, and in very many common readings elsewhere. It is still more interesting to note the frequency with which it agrees with D1 or D1.2 only against M4. It agrees with D1 only but not M4 at 17.24b, 451*3, 452*5, the insertion of 469* (also in D5), 489*19-20 (but not 37-40), 508*1 and 570*2; it agrees with D1.2 but not M4 at 281*2, 295*3 (also in D5), 320*3, 14.18c, App. I 12.80, 623*2 and 658*1. These are certainly not enough to indicate a link between this manuscript and

7. On the other hand it lacks the extra line added by Dm 1 and M4 after line 20 or 21.

8. But we may note its readings *jaṃbhenānena* at 6 pr., *sarvabhūta*° at 7 pr. and *na vet* (w.r. for *cet*) for *yadi* at 13 pr.

these two of the supposed Western recension manuscripts to the exclusion of M4, but it does suggest that D1.2 are aligned in some way with this alternative Malayālam recension of M4 and ms.14052, which is still more obvious when we note the common readings, insertions and omissions of these four manuscripts⁹. There are also traces of links with V1 either of all four manuscripts or of the two Malayālam-script ones¹⁰.

Let me now attempt to draw out the implications of these data. There is, firstly, a sufficient number of unique omissions by ms. 14052 to establish quite clearly that M4 could not have been copied from it, or in all probability from an immediate ancestor. On the other hand, there are around two thirds as many instances of material absent from M4 and present in the Trivandrum manuscript, so ruling out direct copying in the opposite direction. One example of this, listed above, is particularly interesting: its variant at 40.2b gives the same ending as the previous line, thus providing a plausible reason in haplography for M4's omission of the line, if we assume that its exemplar had the same text as the Trivandrum manuscript. There are other instances, such as 52.23c-24b, which show that M4 was prone to omission by haplography. Similarly, there are occasions listed above when the reading of the Trivandrum manuscript seems to be intermediate between a more widely current reading, usually Northern, and that occurring in M4. It is a reasonable inference that the Trivandrum manuscript is closer to the exemplar from which both it and M4 are ultimately derived.

Perhaps less obvious is the fact that, just as M4 shows a greater

9. In just the first ten *sargas* they have common readings which are not found in other mss at 165*3 (not D1), 9.17d, 29c, 35d, 40d, 45d, 10.5bc, 6b, 7cd (not D2), 8d, 193*, 10.12c, 195*3, 10.14d, 16c, 203*, 208*1, 10.33d, 34bc and 41c. They share common insertions at 168*, 203* and 362* (also B2.4), and common omissions occur at 9.14ef, 18-19, 26, 43 (also T3), 10.6cd, 21-25, 13.25, 18.19cd (not Ds), 40 (not D2), 20.23c-34d, App.I 12.35-39, 58, 80-81 and 24.16.

10. Shared features of V1 D1.2 M4 and ms. 14052 are found, for example, at: 698*, 712*2, 716*3, 6, 10, 28.2d, 721*, 733*2, 28.17c, 20cd, 29.2cd, 744*, 746*2, 747*3, 29.12c, 33.18 (omission), 38.16-17 (not D2 but D3) and 50.1b (also D3), while shared features of V1 M4 and ms. 14052 alone occur for example at 47(A)*, in the omission of 53*1 and at 3.28a.

tendency after *sarga* 31 (its own *sarga* 34) to side with the S recension than in the first part of the Ayodhyākāṇḍa, so in general does the Trivandrum manuscript. Nevertheless, it still omits some S material occurring in M4 (such as 42.25cd + 1047* and 1107*1) and conversely includes some N material lacking in M4 (such as 1097*3-4 + 1098*1-2). But, since it also includes some S material absent from M4 (such as 50.11 and 1200*), it is too simplistic to say that it shows a greater tendency than M4 to retain the affinity with the N recension, and indeed there are some instances (such as its reading of both 1217* and 1218*, its reading at 50.11ab, and 54.16cd) which may hint that it is combining both N and S traditions. Such instances may give point to the statement in the colophon to the Yuddhakāṇḍa of the manuscript used as M8 in the Uttarakāṇḍa (regarded by its editor as representing the earlier Malayālam tradition) that its text follows that of Udāli Varadarāja's avowedly eclectic commentary *Vivekatilaka*. However, my own examination of manuscripts of Varadarāja's so far unpublished commentary suggests that, at least for the Ayodhyākāṇḍa, Varadarāja's commentary agrees rather with the Southern tradition in general than with M4 and the Trivandrum manuscript.

On a rather more trivial level, there is the point that the Critical Edition gives a long list of *passages exclusive to M4 (although a sixth should not be there) but, since the Trivandrum manuscript contains all of those that occur within its extant length, these additions are in fact features of the version represented by these two manuscripts. Also, there are in fact many more passages omitted by M4 and these too are shared with the Trivandrum manuscript, as noted above.

Although there are the omissions or additions noted already which they do not share, these two manuscripts are unmistakably close in the extent of their text and this closeness lies in the common absence of material rather than extensive additions. In general, indeed, there is relatively little evidence of expansion compared with many other manuscripts and this should presumably be taken as indicating that they represent a relatively ancient version. If so, it is one that combines features of the present N and S recensions. It is too close to one or the other on every occasion to represent a truly independent recension. Particularly noteworthy are the considerable number of occasions when M4 and the Trivandrum manuscript align

either with D1.2 or – nearly as often – with V1 D1.2 only, especially when we note the not infrequent alignments of ms. 14052 with D1.2 against M4. This strongly suggests that the view by P.L. Vaidya, the editor of the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* in the Critical Edition, that M4 is aligned with the NE recension needs modification¹¹. In reality it and the Trivandrum manuscript align most often with the group Ñ V1 B D1.2, which represents the NE recension without D4 but with D1.2 added, and have a particular affinity with D1.2 (and to a lesser extent V1), which Vaidya assigns to the W recension. This provides a new slant to the vexed question of the status of the W recension with this discovery that two of its four members have strong links with the two Malayālam manuscripts, particularly in fact with the Trivandrum manuscript. However, there are occasions when V1 and D1.2.3 side with S recension against all or most of the rest of the N recension¹², so we cannot say unequivocally that these readings have come from the N recension. Since D1.2.3 come from the Rajasthan or Gujarat area, it is not particularly surprising that they should show a text intermediate between N and S but the position of V1 is more problematic.

Most important of all is the fact that the evidence of ms. 14052 (especially when linked with that of the fragmentary ms. 13468) establishes that we are dealing, not with the idiosyncracies of one copyist, but with a definite alternative tradition which had a measure of popularity in Kerala. Further, the close but far from complete agreement between M4 and the Trivandrum manuscript shows that they derive from a common exemplar, probably at some remove, which presumably means that it must be placed considerably earlier. Internal variation in the Southern recension must therefore be older and more significant than is usually acknowledged and consequently the question of the relative value of the Northern and Southern recensions is a more complex one than was recognised in the constitution of the Critical Edition.

11. *The Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa: Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, critically edited by P.L. VAIDYA (Baroda, 1962), Introduction, p. XXII.

12. Instances are 2119*, 2127* and 2201.